



# Opening the doors

For the Wellcome Trust's **Robert Kiley**, Open Access "isn't an option". Yet, he argues, for OA to be effective funders must be prepared to foot publishing costs

THE INCREASED DEMAND for Open Access (OA) has created new dynamics in the scholarly publishing industry. Just seven years ago, the market was limited to a small number of OA publishers.

Now, however, OA has exploded. The largest journal on the planet (PLOS One) is fully Open Access, publishing in excess of 20,000 articles a year and, virtually all subscription journals now offer a hybrid OA option.

To a large extent, this growth is the consequence of funding organisations developing policies

that demand that the outputs of the research they fund must be made freely available. At Wellcome Trust, for example, OA isn't an option or an afterthought. If a researcher is successful in obtaining funding from the Trust, the peer-reviewed research outputs that arise from that grant must be made Open Access as soon as possible and in any event, within six months of publication.

#### Default set to open

What the Wellcome Trust is trying to do is set the default publishing

option to "open". We genuinely believe that OA is good not only for the researcher, who can more readily access valuable information, but also for science and society as a whole. We passionately believe in OA: If we need to push a little to encourage our researchers to comply, then push we will. To this end we have announced a number of sanctions that will apply if a Trust-funded researcher does not comply with our OA policy.

We also recognise that publishers play an important role in the scholarly communication process—from managing the peer review

process to selecting which articles to publish—and as such see publishing costs as a legitimate research cost. And one therefore, that we are prepared to meet. In the words of Christoph Kratky, outgoing president of the Austrian Science Fund (FWF), funders who support OA must "put their money where their mouth is".

Thus far, the preferred model for support of Open Access is for publishers to levy an Article Processing Charge (APC). When paying an APC—whether for a fully OA or hybrid journal—a researcher should be aware of the price, what value-added services are provided (i.e. direct deposition by the publisher in a specified repository) and what re-use rights are included in the charge.

As of April 2013, Wellcome Trust requires that when its funding is used to pay an APC, the publisher must make such works available under the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC-BY). We believe that the full research and economic benefit of published content will only be realised when there are no restrictions on access to, and reuse of, this information.

We believe the goal must be to unleash that content while still allowing publishers to recoup their costs in an effective market. From a funder perspective, CC-BY achieves this aim, and has now emerged as the standard licence for open access (OA) publishing by commercial and non-commercial publishers who recoup their costs from publication fees and other revenue streams.

Analysis recently conducted at Wellcome Trust shows that if everything we funded was made OA, and assuming that the current average APC was maintained, then the total cost would represent around 1.5% of our research spending. That is a real and significant amount of money. However, we believe that ensuring that everything we fund is fully OA is a cost worth paying.

*Robert Kiley is head of digital services at the Wellcome Trust, the London-based charity which funds about £600m in biomedical research each year. Kiley is speaking at today's Open Access panel discussion, Hall 4.2, Professional and Scientific Information Hotspot.*



**“The goal must be to unleash that content whilst still allowing publishers to recoup their costs in an effective market”**

Robert Kiley